



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,701	11/12/2003	Paul Lehmann	21435	5722
151	7590	01/07/2008	EXAMINER	
HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC. PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT 340 KINGSLAND STREET NUTLEY, NJ 07110			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1652		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		01/07/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,701	LEHMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hope A. Robinson	1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 5-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/16/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Application Status

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1652.
2. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed September 13, 2007 on October 5, 2007 is acknowledged.
3. Claims 1-2 and 5-14 are pending and are under examination.

New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claims 6 is confusing as the claim lists items (d-g), however there is no nexus between these and the recited analog. Clarification is required as set forth in for example items (a-c).

Basis For NonStatutory Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1 and 5-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4-15 of copending Application No. 11/013,560. An obvious-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or

would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). *See In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).* Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The instant application claim 1 is directed to a method of treating disturbances in iron distribution in a patient suffering from heart disease comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of human erythropoietin. The dependent claims hereto are directed to an erythropoietin that is epoetin alfa or beta (claim 3); SEQ ID NO:1 (claim 4); a modification of 1 to 6 glycosylation sites (claim 5); a darbepoetin (claim 6); pegylated (claim 7); and a conjugate having a particular structure as set forth in claims 8-14. The copending application claim 1 is directed to a method of treating disturbances in iron distribution in a patient suffering from chronic inflammatory intestinal disease comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of human erythropoietin. The dependent claims hereto are directed to an erythropoietin that is epoetin alfa or beta (claim 4); SEQ ID NO:1 (claim 5); a modification of 1 to 6 glycosylation sites (claim 6); a darbepoetin (claim 7); pegylated (claim 8); and a conjugate having a particular structure as set forth in claims 9-15. The instant application claims differ from the copending application in that the patient is suffering from heart disease, whereas the copending application patient is suffering from chronic inflammatory intestinal disease, however, the methods have one step, administering erythropoietin, thus the resulting effect will be the same. Thus, the two sets of claims differ in scope but are obvious one over the other, as the intended use does not materially change the composition administered.

7. Claims 1 and 5-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-15 and 17-26 of copending Application No. 10/634,477. An obvious-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). *See In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).* Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The instant application claim 1 is directed to a method of treating disturbances in iron distribution in a patient suffering from heart disease comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of human erythropoietin. The dependent claims hereto are directed to an erythropoietin that is epoetin alfa or beta (claim 3); SEQ ID NO:1 (claim 4); a modification of 1 to 6 glycosylation sites (claim5); a darbepoetin (claim 6); pegylated (claim 7); and a conjugate having a particular structure as set forth in claims 8-14. The copending application claim 1 is directed to a method of treating disturbances in iron distribution in a patient suffering from diabetes comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of human erythropoietin. The dependent claims hereto are directed to an erythropoietin that is epoetin alfa or beta (claim 3); SEQ ID NO:1 (claim 4); a modification of 1 to 6 glycosylation sites (claim5); a darbepoetin (claim 6); pegylated (claim 7); and a conjugate having a particular structure as set forth in claims 8-12. The instant application claims differ from the copending application in that the patient is

suffering from heart disease, whereas the copending application patient is suffering from diabetes, however, the methods have one step, administering erythropoietin, thus the resulting effect will be the same. Moreover, the art generally recognizes that heart disease is a risk with diabetes, for example type II diabetes. Thus, the two sets of claims differ in scope but are obvious one over the other, as the intended use does not materially change the composition administered.

Response to Arguments

8. The response filed has been considered. Note that a new rejection has been made under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for the reasons stated above. Applicant's comments regarding withdrawn rejections will not be addressed since moot since the rejections no longer exist. However, the comments made regarding the double patenting will be addressed. Applicants state that the ODP rejections are premature, however as no Terminal disclaimer was filed the rejections remain. Furthermore, as stated above, the ODP rejections are necessary because the instant claims are a species of the genus claimed in the copending application. Thus, the rejection remains since no TD was filed.

Conclusion

9. No claims are allowable and claim 2 is objected to as depending from a rejected based claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Primary Examiner

HOPE ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER